









A S C H E M E

FOR THE

DEMOLITION

OF

THREE CITY CHURCHES,

PROPOSED BY

SIR H. W. PEEK, BART., M.P.,

AND THE

CORRESPONDENCE CONSEQUENT THEREON.

1878.

PRINTED BY

J. DRAPER, 5 & 6, LITTLE TOWER STREET,
LONDON, E.C.

A SCHEME FOR THE DEMOLITION OF THREE CITY CHURCHES.

THE following Scheme appeared in the *City Press* on the 28th of August, 1878, and *Citizen* of the 30th :—

BILLINGSGATE AND TOWER WARDS.—*September, 1878.*

The widening of Eastcheap and Tower Street, forming the direct route between the city and the docks, appears at last an improvement likely to be undertaken in the near future, either by the Corporation of London, which has had it under consideration for forty years past, or the Company applying for powers to complete the Inner Circle Railway, aided (for the sake of the thoroughfare) by a subsidy from the Metropolitan Board of Works. Many interests of the ratepayers and others of the neighbourhood are involved, and one is now brought under notice in the hope that it may receive due consideration.

During thirty years past several abortive attempts have been made to deal with the super-abundant churches of the neighbourhood. Now that it is likely many more houses will come down, and the small resident population (barely one-third what it was in 1841) be still further reduced, the time appears opportune for again calling attention to the important subject. The parishes which ought to be dealt with are seven, the churches four, all within two hundred yards one of another, viz :—

PARISHES. (* Means with a Rectory House.)	Rector.	Patrons.	Population in 1871.	Valued by Clergy List.	Valued by Bishop of London's Commissioners.
R* St. Botolph, Billingsgate, with St. George, Botolph Lane	M. MacColl, 1871	Crown and Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's	154 } 162 }	£ 381	£ 385
R St. Dunstan's-in-the-East.	J. L. Ross, 1873. S. Gall, Lecturer.	Archbishop of Canterbury.	669	560	
R* St. Gabriel, Fenchurch, with St. Margaret Pattens	J. L. Fish, 1866	Lord Chancellor and Corporation of London.	125 } 104 }	214	811
R* St. Mary-at-Hill, with St. Andrew Hubbard	A. Trower, 1874 J. W. Gleadall, Lecturer.	Parishioners and Sir Henry Peek, Bart.	477 } 139 }	413	415

By which figures it will be seen that the total residents, probably, do not now number more than 1,300, for whom there are 1,750 seats, and, including the value of three rectory houses and two lectureships,

not much less than £3,000 per annum for the duty to be performed. The duty may be judged from the fact that on several successive Sundays this spring the attendance (excluding officials and their families) at all four churches put together has not nearly averaged—one hundred!

Such is the present state of this long-standing reproach. What ought to be done? The Corporation of London, on the 16th May, 1878, made a grant of £210 to the London City Mission,—a society founded by churchmen and dissenters, acting in unison for the benefit of the overgrown, ill-endowed, and, for the most part, practically heathen parishes of the metropolis,—its Billingsgate Market Committee having, a few months before, intimated to the City Missionary that he “shall not be interfered with in conducting religious services in the Market on Sunday morning when the gates are open” (*City Mission Magazine* for 1877, page 91); the idea, apparently, being that, as the Weigh-House Dissenting Chapel, on Fish Street Hill, which will seat a thousand, ordinarily commands an attendance of six hundred, somewhat similar ministrations might, at any rate, be tried with advantage. Some good, it is to be hoped, will result from the trial. But the question, what ought to be done with four churches and seven parochial organizations, which, by the widening of thoroughfares and other causes, have not for many years past and never again can fulfil their former attaching duties, remains to be answered.

Previous failures to remedy what is really neither more nor less than a wicked waste of means for good have shown one thing clearly enough, that there must be a special Act of Parliament to control the various and conflicting interests involved. And the following suggestions of what such Act should, in the two main particulars do, are submitted in the hope of drawing local if not general attention to the subject:—

1. That the seven parishes named should be welded into one, and as by far the finest monument of the four—one of Sir Christopher Wren's *chefs-d'œuvre*—and almost equi-distant from All-Hallows, Barking (population in 1871, 1,065; *Clergy List* value £956) and St. Magnus, London Bridge (population in 1871, 649; *Clergy List* value £689, and a rectory house), St. Dunstan's-in-the-East become the parish church, with an income of at least £1,000 per annum, and a sufficient maintenance fund secured. Subject to such provision, the entire ecclesiastical property (sites of churches, parsonages, tithe rent charge, glebes, &c.) of all seven parishes should be publicly sold, and with the proceeds, at least three—there would probably be enough realized for six—new churches built and adequately endowed in parts of the metropolis where they would do most good, the patronage of which might vest in the Bishop of the Diocese. (Whether the extinction of seven separate interests would be a measure likely to commend it-

self to vestry clerks and others who have long looked upon them as fair game is doubtful,—it would be difficult to name any other good purpose which has been served since the Fire Act kept up separate interests in united parishes).

2. Two or more well-considered schemes have fallen through from difficulties as to patronage, that £ s. & d. hindrance which has lately been under the consideration of the House of Lords. Patrons, of course, must be properly compensated. No one would wish a public advantage gained at the expense of private wrong. But in the present case the difficulty is not insuperable. The Crown, the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, and Sir Henry Peek, all present to livings under the value of £300 per annum. Let their five interests be extinguished by equitable payments from the fund created by the sale of the ecclesiastical property named, the sums allotted to each being applied in augmentation of one or more of their small livings. In this the only private patron would willingly concur, leaving but the Corporation of London and the parishioners of St. Mary-at-Hill to be dealt with. As the proposed amalgamated parish of St. Dunstan's-in-the-East would run into the Wards of Billingsgate, Langbourne, and Tower, a fit arrangement might be made by placing the advowson in the hands of three Aldermen and twenty-four Common Councilmen, and an equal number of parishioners, as trustees—the Lord Mayor, in case of equality, having a casting vote. Fifty-five trustees is undoubtedly a large number, but for a moiety of one parish (St. Mary-at-Hill) there are now no less than fifteen, and when, in past times, a new list has had to be made out, a still larger number has customarily been named. At any rate, under such an arrangement, the choice of a rector would be more open, and more with the public good in view than is sometimes seen in selections by Ecclesiastical Corporations and City Companies with their own connections to serve.

In addition to Ecclesiastical Funds, the gross charitable income of the seven parishes is as follows :—

			£	s.	d.
ST. BOTOLPH, Billingsgate	469	9	5
ST. GEORGE, Botolph Lane	134	1	0
ST. DUNSTAN'S-IN-THE-EAST	3,760	7	9
ST. GABRIEL, Fenchurch	38	5	1
ST. MARGARET PATTENS	558	18	2
ST. MARY-AT-HILL	2,028	19	2
ST. ANDREW HUBBARD	105	5	3
Total per annum...			£7,095	5	10

To enquire into and, it is to be hoped, deal with these a royal commission has been appointed and within a short time may be expected to commence its labours.

The following correspondence has resulted :—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CITY PRESS."

"Sir,—Under the above heading in your issue of Saturday there appears a communicated article on the demolition of the City churches. Feeling confident that you have no desire to represent but one aspect of such a question as this, or to publish statistics which are, I fear, based on insufficient information, I address these few remarks to you in the hope that you will give them the same publicity which you gave to the aforesaid article. After a residence of sixteen years in the City, I cannot but rejoice in the news that "the widening of Eastcheap and Tower Street appears at last an improvement likely to be undertaken in the near future." The churches to be dealt with are four, and how does your correspondent propose to deal with them? First of all he says that four churches are clearly not required for 1,300 inhabitants. This is quite certain. But the question then arises, If we have too many churches, on what principle are we to pull them down? What principle of selection is to be applied in the retention of any particular church? Your correspondent proposes that three churches should be demolished, and that the other, St. Dunstan's-in-the-East, should be left standing, for the following reasons :—

"(a) As being by far the finest monument of the four.

"(b) As being almost equi-distant from All-Hallows', Barking, and St. Magnus, London Bridge.

"It appears, then, that the only principles of selection to be applied are the architectural claims of the building and the locality of the church. Should there not be added to, aye, placed before both of these, another principle? Has the spiritual aspect of the question no influence in the matter? I contend that it has; and I am surprised to find that your correspondent, whilst inveighing against this wicked waste of means for good, never once mentions the 'spiritual good' of the parishioners as a factor in the question. I quite agree with him that great means for good are being wasted, but, judging from the comparative spiritual life of the four parishes, I should have said that St. Dunstan's-in-the-East was just the church that ought not to stand. Let us briefly compare the churches in this regard.

"1. St. Dunstan's: two services weekly; average attendance, 5.

"2. St. Botolph, Billingsgate: two services weekly (I think); average attendance, 5.

"3. St. Gabriel with St. Margaret: seven services weekly; attendance weekly, quite 100 or 150.

"4. St. Mary-at-Hill: seventeen services weekly; weekly average from 260 to 300.

“Now, as people will not come to worship God because the church was built by Sir C. Wren, but from the style of service afforded them, the interests of the parishioners point to the retention of the two last-named churches, or, more especially, of the last one. I fear that your correspondent must have been singularly unhappy in the choice of days on which to visit these churches. He states that on several successive Sundays this spring the attendance at all four churches has not nearly averaged one hundred. Lying before me I have a return of the attendance at one of these churches during the last year, and I find it states that the number of worshippers was upwards of 14,000 and the number of communicants 665. At another of these churches the attendance must be, at the least, 5,000 per annum. Two suggestions are then made in the article, to each of which I must take strong exception: (1) That the ecclesiastical property of the said parishes be sold, and the proceeds devoted to the erection of three or six new churches in the diocese. So far so good. If they are to be sold, by all means let new churches be built in overcrowded parishes. But why should the Bishop of London gain the patronage of six new churches? The more correct method of acting would seem to be by transferring the patronage simply to the new-built churches, and not by creating new patrons at all. (2*a*) By way of compensation your correspondent proposes that, as each of the patrons present to livings under the value of £300 per annum, they should be allowed, with the residue of the amount gained by the sale of the churches, to augment their own livings to the value of £300. Again, I ask, on what principle of fairness can churches be pulled down in the diocese of London, and a part of the spoil be appropriated to the augmenting of the livings of patrons, which may be far enough away from London. (2*b*) He proposes that the advowson of the remaining church be placed in the hands of 55 trustees, in the hope that ‘under such an arrangement the choice of a rector would be more open, and more with the public good in view than is sometimes seen in selections by ecclesiastical corporations and City companies with their own ends to serve.’ The only difference this would make would be that the new rector would be appointed according as he uttered the shibboleth of the majority of the trustees. Whether this would be an improvement I leave your readers to judge.

“I am, &c.,

“VERITAS.”

TO THE EDITOR OF THE “CITY PRESS.”

“Sir,—I beg to be allowed to say a few words respecting a document entitled ‘Billingsgate and Tower Wards,’ which appeared in the last issue of the *City Press*. Even were it not clear from internal evidence that ‘the only private patron’ himself was the writer, the peculiarities of grammar and composition, together with other

peculiarities, would be quite sufficient to convince anyone acquainted with that gentleman's productions whence it came. It is not my intention at the present moment to discuss the merits or demerits of his scheme; all I wish to state is that should such a scheme really be taken into consideration by those who are competent to deal with such a case, it is to be hoped the private interests of one person may not be the basis upon which to adjudicate on the matter, and also that due consideration may be given to the real reasons for the zealous interference for the supposed good of other districts. My object in noticing such a document is simply to state that the information touching the attendance at the church of St. Mary-at-Hill and the other churches is far from being correct; the number of worshippers given by the writer not even representing truly the attendance at my own church.

"I am, &c.,

"ARTHUR TROWER.

"The Rectory, St. Mary-at-Hill, September 2nd."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CITY PRESS."

"Sir,—You publish in the *City Press* of Saturday a communication on the subject of certain City churches. In it occurs this remarkable statement: 'By far the finest monument of the four—one of Sir Christopher Wren's *chefs d'œuvre*—St. Dunstan's-in-the-East, &c.' A writer, apparently so well up in local facts, should know that St. Dunstan's, save as regards its tower and spire, which are not in the least superior to those by the same architect at the neighbouring church of St. Margaret Pattens, is not the work of Sir Christopher Wren, having been rebuilt about fifty years ago. Its thin nineteenth century Gothic may be superior to the splendid Renaissance interior of St. Mary-at-Hill, but it owes nothing to the name of the City's great architect. It is wonderful what blunders people make about City churches. A few evenings ago the *Globe* gravely announced the union of six parishes, united since the Fire of London, and the removal of three churches which have had no existence since that calamity. With strict accuracy, however, it stated that 'no public worship is now conducted in these churches.' Can you inform your readers what were the 'difficulties of the patronage' through which 'two or more well-considered schemes have fallen through?' It would be especially interesting to hear why the scheme for uniting St. Mary-at-Hill, St. Margaret Pattens, and St. George has broken down.

"I am, &c.,

"CRUX."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CITY PRESS."

"Sir,—The paper referring to Billingsgate and Tower Wards in your impression, invites attention, and may be viewed in two aspects

at least, ecclesiastically and commercially. Ecclesiastically it is to be deplored that so few persons attend these churches for religious worship; but how can a remedy be found by taking them away, while the system remains that they who do attend have no voice in the choice of the preacher—the next presentation to the living, being in other hands, no good can be expected, whether the churches stand where they are, or others be erected elsewhere with the money. The Chinaman may indeed spurn the Christian religion if he sees such people dishonouring the graves of our ancestors, and that apparently only to put the land on which they rest to commercial purposes. Commercially, Eastcheap is invoked; but though improvements are asked for in the way to the Fish Market and in the way to the Docks from London Bridge, it would appear that taking away 17 assessments—rateable value £1,796—out of a total of 77 assessments, as per list 1869, of the parish of St. Andrew Hubbard, to make wider that part of the street which is now wider than the greater part of Great Tower Street, is a poor prospect for the ratepayers of this parish who may be left to make up for the loss to parish rates and taxes.

“I am, &c.,

September 4.

“EASTCHEAP.”

TO THE EDITOR OF THE “CITY PRESS.”

“Sir,—I am unwilling to credit the author of the scheme communicated to you with mere motives of personal advantage, still less with pique at any of the clergy of the churches he proposes to deal with. Truly, the scheme, which, I think, hints at no compensation to any but patrons, savours more of a Paris Commune than of the present Conservatism of the nation and City of London. But I venture to follow suit with Mr. Trower and ‘Veritas’ in disputing the statements as to the amount of spiritual good wrought by these churches. I know one well, and have seen this year at it as many as 47 communicants on Easter-Day, the large majority present at an early hour, a proof that the church cannot be useless to the neighbourhood. I have seen the same church nearly full, too, on week days; and, after all, I suppose, it must be conceded that, even in the busy City, men have a God to glorify and souls to be saved on more days than the first in the week.

“I am, &c.,

“SUB CRUCE.”

TO THE EDITOR OF THE “CITY PRESS.”

“Sir,—I am glad to see the few facts to which you were so good to give prominence in your journal have attracted some attention. The subject is an important one, and should be carefully considered in all its bearings. As regards the attendances at St. Dunstan’s-in-

the-East, St. Botolph, St. Gabriel, and St. Mary-at-Hill, my informant, who lives in the immediate neighbourhood, is prepared, from his note book, to give chapter and verse in support of the statement that this year, for three months running, with 1,750 sittings, the attendance on Sunday mornings (excluding officials and their families) at all four churches put together has not nearly averaged 100, which is indeed borne out by the figures, intended to be rebutting, given by 'Veritas' in the *City Press* of Wednesday, the 4th inst. Last Sunday morning, the 8th inst., the two first named churches (credited by 'Veritas' with five worshippers each) were closed, St. Gabriel's was counted inside, and St. Mary-at-Hill back and front as the congregation left, with the confirmatory result that, allowing St. Dunstan's and St. Botolph's their 10, less than half a hundred would have covered the whole four. On architectural matters opinions vary, perhaps more than in most. Thanking 'Crux' for setting me to rights as to Sir Christopher Wren having been the architect only of its tower and spire, I must still adhere to my opinion that St. Dunstan's is, as an ecclesiastical building, by far the finest of the four, while, if the most generally convenient position for the seven parishes and the public generally, be desired, it certainly bears the palm. I would, if I could, inform 'Crux' and your readers how it was that the late scheme came to grief. Mr. Gibbs, of Christ Church, Newgate Street, knows—and so I expect does Canon Gregory. It is this failure which makes me in favour of a commission to take evidence all round, and then an Act of Parliament to give effect to the conclusions arrived at. 'Eastcheap' apparently would agree with my idea as to placing the selection of the rector of the amalgamated living in the hands of 55 well-known parishioners; while as regards rating, he must bear in mind revisions are periodically made, and further, that railways are not exempt. Did 'Sub Cruce' see 47 parishioners communicants at any one of the four churches? One of the fourteen churchwardens told me that since the changes at St. Ethelburga's, sometimes a good many would come, but that the parishioners at church might generally be counted on the fingers of one hand. When the Common Council resumes its sittings, I purpose sending a copy of my former communication to each member, and hope that you will allow the subject to be well threshed out in your columns.

"I am, &c.,

"HENRY W. PEEK.

"20, Eastcheap, September 11th."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'CITY PRESS.'

"Sir,—While thanking you for your courtesy in inserting my last letter, I must again venture to trespass on that courtesy, as there are some statements made by Sir Henry W. Peck in the *City Press* of

Wednesday which call for explanation or refutation. I will divide my remarks under the following heads, viz :—

- “(a) I exceedingly regret that while Sir Henry Peek says that ‘this subject should be carefully considered in *all* its bearings,’ and expresses a hope that ‘you will allow the subject to be well threshed out in your columns,’ yet he, in his former communication, deals only with that aspect of the question which concerns himself as a patron, and in his present letter simply passes over another aspect of it without notice, when put forward by one, who is in no way officially connected with the churches at all. This, to use the mildest term, seems inconsistent in one who proposes to act simply with an eye to the welfare of the parishes concerned.
- “(b) The statement made by me as to the attendance at the churches, so far from being confirmatory of that made by Sir H. Peek, is clearly subversive of it, unless my powers of arithmetical calculation are sadly out of order this morning. I stated that at one church alone the attendance was 15,000, which in round numbers gives a weekly average of 300 ; any of these 110 or 120 are always worshippers on Sunday. Add to this 80 or 90 at the least for a second church, and 10 for the remaining two, and I cannot at all understand how $110 \times 80 \times 10$ equals not nearly 100.
- “(c) Again, I would point out that Sir H. Peek has altered in his second letter his statement in the following manner : first, he says, ‘On several successive Sundays;’ in the second he limits his members to ‘Sunday morning.’ Will Sir Henry Peek kindly explain why the evening worshippers at a church are to be excluded from the calculation of a congregation ? Feeling sure that Sir Henry, as a good churchman, attends Divine Service on Sunday evening, I should have thought that the fact would have struck him that the evening is generally larger than the morning congregation.
- “(d) Will he kindly explain his deep-rooted objection to the reckoning of the families of officials in the attendance list ? This remark, I believe applies mainly to his own parish church. Have the families of officials no part in divine worship, and no connexion with the parish ?
- “(e) I venture to predict, in spite of the extremely convenient situation of St. Dunstan’s, that that church would be a failure in an attempt to hold the church-goers of the four parishes. People who go to church to worship will not reckon the number of yards they may have to walk ; they will have what they want, if they go miles for it.
- “(f) Will Sir Henry also explain what the 24 Common Councilmen have to do with the choice of a new rector for the united parishes ? I fail to see what right they have to interfere.

“(g) Lastly ; Sir Henry Peek cannot be unaware of the fact that where two churches are adjacent, the parish system exists in theory rather than in fact. Any attempt to reason from the number of parishioners at service will always be misleading from the fact that thousands of churchmen worship God in churches which are not theirs, if we restrict them to the use of the parish church. Trusting to your sense of fairness to insert this letter, and feeling sure that Sir Henry Peek will be glad to have the matter ‘well thrashed out.’

“I am, &c.,

“September 12th.”

“VERITAS.

TO THE EDITOR OF “THE CITIZEN.”

“Sir,—I am glad to find many interested in the facts circulated by me in reference to the churches of St. Botolph, St. Dunstan, St. Gabriel, and St. Mary-at-Hill, and which, when the holidays are over, I purpose sending round more generally. I have stated that ‘on several successive Sundays this spring the attendance (exclusive of officials and their families) at all four churches put together has not nearly averaged one hundred.’ My informant, who resides in one of the wards, assures me his note-book proves the fact, and further states that on the 8th inst. the first two churches were closed for repairs, and that after morning service not half a hundred came out of the other two. But does not ‘Veritas’ prove the correctness of my figures ? He gives the average attendance at St. Dunstan’s and St. Botolph as 5 each ; St. Margaret, seven services weekly ; weekly attendance quite 100 or 150, rather wide, but the higher figure gives the average of 22. St. Mary-at-Hill, seventeen services weekly ; weekly average 260 to 300, the higher figure gives 18, or an average for four churches of 50, of which it is only fair to suppose a large proportion consists of officials and their families. ‘Veritas’ asks why the Bishop of London should gain the patronage of six new churches. I suggested the bishop of the diocese in which the new churches were built, and quite think the Bishop of Rochester, as representing the south side of the Thames, to which so many families formerly resident in the wards have migrated, should have his share. I hardly understand what is meant by the term ‘spoil.’ There is nothing to prevent me from to-morrow selling my moiety of the advowson of St. Mary-at-Hill with next presentation and spending the money as I please, instead of which I am willing to be bound to give every sixpence to a benefice, the church of which, owing to the poverty of its endowment, was actually the protest of successive bishops notwithstanding, shut up for over a century, the rectors, however, pocketing the income all the same. The Act enabling the Lord Chancellor to sell his poor advowsons, and so improve them, has worked well. I quite agree with many churchmen that no clergyman with a fair amount of duty

to do should receive less than £300 per annum, to which amount a few years ago, most, if not all, the South London parishes were made up, and so, though glad to see it sharply criticised, I fail to discern anything objectionable in my proposition. The term ‘Shibboleth’ does not appear to me to apply—no one now makes religious opinions either a stepping-stone or a bar to the office of Lord Mayor, Alderman, or Common Councilman, and to my knowledge the twenty-eight gentlemen named vary very widely as certainly do the present fifteen trustees of St. Mary-at-Hill. The remarks already made in the main answer the second letter, leaving me only to add that I have no private interests whatever to serve; for upwards of thirty years I have worked in this same direction, believing that if the Church of England is to hold her own it must be by making the most of all her ‘means for good.’

“Yours faithfully,

“(Signed)

HENRY W. PEEK.

“20, Eastcheap, E C.,

“10th September, 1878.”

TO THE EDITOR OF “THE CITIZEN.”

“Sir,—In a paper, which is being circulated pretty widely by Sir Henry Peek, of Eastcheap, a copy of which appeared in your paper of August 29th, occur these words: ‘Two or more well-considered schemes have fallen through from difficulties as to patronage, that £ s. d. hindrance which has lately been under consideration of the House of Lords.’ Now, sir, no one, perhaps, is better able to enlighten the public upon the subject than the writer of these words, and it is much to be regretted that he, having stated so much, did not go on to give the public the benefit of his knowledge. As, however, he has thought it more prudent not to do so, I may as well state a few facts which may help to aid him in that which he is so anxious to do, viz., ‘draw local, if not general attention to the subject.’ It is quite true that at different times during the past few years several attempts have been made to unite the parishes of St. George, Botolph Lane, with St. Mary-at-Hill, and also St. Margaret-Pattens and St. George, Botolph Lane, with St. Mary-at-Hill, but each time the attempt has been made, from some cause or other it has failed. It would be trespassing too much upon your space to enter into details regarding more than one of the ‘abortive attempts;’ it will suffice to touch very briefly upon a few of the facts relating to the last, especially as that is the most important. In the year 1874. Sir H Peek, applied to the Bishop of London to issue a commission to inquire into the possible amalgamation of the parishes of St. Margaret Pattens, St. George, Botolph Lane, and St. Mary-at-Hill, the church of the latter, in his estimation, ‘Wren’s *chef d’œuvre*’ in this locality, being made the church of Billingsgate. A commission was issued, meetings

were held at Sir H. Peek's house, the subject was fully gone into, a scheme was drawn up, and a fair prospect of matters terminating in accordance with his suggestion, when a dispute arose between the rector of St. Mary-at-Hill and himself, respecting the sale of the glebe belonging to that parish, then leased to the latter, and which he had been sometime anxious to purchase; a suit in the Rolls Court was the consequence, and the decision was against Sir H. Peek, who then declined to have anything more to do with the scheme.

"PHILALETHES."

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE CITIZEN."

"Sir,—Having for many years worshipped in the church of St. Mary-at-Hill, under the ministrations of the late rector, during which period I resided in the parish, I feel somewhat interested in its proposed removal, and as I have, at various times, visited, almost without exception, every City church, I feel in a position to speak of the waste of strength which has been going on for so long. The rector of St. Mary's, or the rector of any of the others, may swell the figures as he pleases, but this will not alter the fact that one church out of the four will suffice for every purpose, spiritually or otherwise, and that from its position, its architecture, and its present style of services, St. Dunstan's is the church which ought to remain. The rector of St. Mary's may possibly increase the attendance by a little additional musical attraction to the extent of a few hundreds in the course of the year, but such will have no weight in argument with those (like myself) who have seen suburban parishes of 10,000 or 15,000 with church accommodation for not as many hundreds. The scheme for demolition of City churches generally is a good and praiseworthy one, but much too slow, and the pockets of many who can least afford it are drawn upon for church building purposes, whilst City endowments, in many instances, benefit the rector and his officials only.

"Yours faithfully,

"H. H.

"Putney."

THE appended table is furnished to us by the Rev. Arthur Trower, Rector of St. Mary-at-Hill.

Number of persons attending the Sunday Services at the Church of St. Mary-at-Hill, from February 10th to September 15th, 1878:—

SUNDAYS	Early Celebrations 8 A.M.	11 A.M.	No. of Com- municants Mid-day	7 P.M.	TOTAL	SUNDAYS	Early Celebrations 8 A.M.	11 A.M.	No. of Com- municants Mid-day	7 P.M.	TOTAL
Feb. 10...	7	55	...	68	130	June 2...	...	51	18	59	110
„ 17...	12	53	...	61	126	„ 9...	10	36	...	60	106
„ 24...	9	56	...	72	137	„ †16...	...	46	†19	64	100
Mar. 3...	—	58	22	64	122	„ 23...	9	48	...	60	117
„ 10...	13	48	...	69	130	„ 30...	10	45	...	61	116
„ 17...	11	46	...	62	119	July 7...	...	57	16	62	119
„ 24...	9	46	...	63	118	„ 14...	7	48	...	59	114
„ 31...	11	56	...	58	125	„ 21...	11	52	...	59	122
April 7...	...	46	17	58	104	„ 28...	8	38	...	64	110
„ 14...	11	47	...	63	121	Aug. 4...	...	46	19	53	99
„ *21...	13	58	*15	64	135	„ 11 ..	11	40	...	61	112
„ 28...	10	48	...	54	112	„ 18...	14	52	...	69	135
May 5...	...	42	19	67	109	„ 25...	9	57	...	65	131
„ 12...	10	42	...	72	124	Sept. 1...	...	46	19	80	126
„ 19...	10	47	...	56	113	„ 8...	9	48	...	60	117
„ 26...	9	50	...	55	114	„ 15...	8	63	...	82	153
			73						91		

* Easter Sunday.

† Trinity Sunday.

“The duty may be judged from the fact that on several successive Sundays *this Spring the attendance* (excluding officials and their families) *at all four Churches*,—(S. Margaret Pattens, S. George's, Botolph Lane, S. Dunstan-in-the-East, and S. Mary-at-Hill) *put together*, has not nearly averaged *One Hundred*.”

SIR H. W. PEEK'S Statement.
(City Press and Citizen.)

“(c) Again, I would point out that Sir H. Peek has altered in his second letter his statement in the following manner. First, he states, on *several successive Sundays*,—in the second he *limits his numbers to Sunday mornings*. Will Sir Henry Peek kindly explain why the *evening worshippers* at a Church are to be excluded from the calculation of a congregation?”

“(d) Will he explain his deep-rooted objection to the reckoning of the *families of the officials* in the attendance list? This remark, I believe, applies mainly to his own Parish Church. Have the *families of officials* no part in Divine Worship, and no connexion with the Parish?”

Letter by “VERITAS.”
(City Press, Sept. 14, 1878.)

In corroboration of the statement made by “Veritas” in his letter which appeared in the *City Press*, September 4, 1878.

“(4) S. Mary-at-Hill, 17 Services weekly, weekly average from 260 to 300.”

The number of persons present in Church from September 1 to 7 inclusive, and from September 8 to 14.

	8 a.m.	11 a.m.	7 p.m.	Total.		8 a.m.	11 a.m.	7 p.m.	Total.
Sept. 1, Sunday...	...	46	80	126	Sept. 8, Sunday ..	9	48	60	117
„ 2, Monday..	14	...	17	31	„ 9, Monday...	13	...	15	28
„ 3, Tuesday..	14	...	22	36	„ 10, Tuesday..	12	...	17	29
„ 4, Wednesday	10	(1 p.m.)	15	36	„ 11, Wednesday	10	(1 p.m.)	14	36
„ 5, Thursday	No Service	...	20	20	„ 12, Thursday	12	...	No Service	12
„ 6, Friday ...	9	10	32	51	„ 13, Friday ...	11	8	35	55
„ 7, Saturday	11	...	14	25	„ 14, Saturday	11	...	16	27
Weekly Attendance 325					Weekly Attendance 304				

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE CITIZEN."

"Sir,—As Sir Henry Peek has criticised so minutely my comments on his scheme, I must again trespass on your courtesy, and ask you to insert these few remarks on that criticism. I will divide my remarks under the following heads, viz. :—

"(a) My figures do not prove Sir Henry Peek's statement in any way whatever. If Sir Henry worships God in church on a week-day, which, as a good churchman, I have no doubt that he does, he must be struck by the fact that the number of people who do so form a very small proportion of the entire worshippers in a week. The reasons for this being so are quite obvious. 150 divided by 7 does equal 22, and 300 divided by 17 does equal 18. I assent to Sir Henry's calculation; I object to his logic; for it by no means follows that because 300 people attend 17 services, the Sunday morning congregation equals 18. This point, then, I think, is quite answered. Last Sunday, the 8th instant, the official return from one church was 48 in the morning and 60 in the evening. I cannot reconcile with this his informant's statement, unless there were a very dense fog hanging about which covered with gloom the retreating worshippers.

"(b) I did not intend to use the word 'spoil' in any way which could hurt Sir Henry's feelings. While willing to give him credit for his great sacrifices and earnest endeavours for the good of the church, I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that if, with the proceeds of the sale of City Church property, he augment a living, say in Devonshire, valued at £50 to £300, he is the gainer, in so far that, if he wish at any time to sell the living, it will realise just six times the amount. I would assure Sir Henry that I have no desire whatever to wound his susceptibilities in any way by the inadvertent use of a word in an ambiguous sense.

- “(c) Sir Henry objects to my use of the word ‘Shibboleth.’ He states a fact to which I can give my most cordial approbation, that ‘no one now makes religious opinions a stepping-stone to or a bar to the office of Lord Mayor,’ &c. On the strength of this assertion Sir Henry says that the term ‘Shibboleth’ does not apply. With all due respect, it appears to me that it is Sir Henry’s own remark which does *not* apply. I never asserted that religious views made a stepping-stone or a bar to the office of *Lord Mayor*. What I did say was this, that the *Rector* of the united parishes would be appointed as he uttered the ‘Shibboleth’ of this or that party. To that statement I still adhere. The statement that the 28 gentlemen named by Sir Henry Peek vary greatly in religious opinions proves nothing, so far as I can see at present.
- “(d) As Sir Henry expresses his pleasure at having his scheme sharply criticised, I venture to lay these remarks before him, feeling sure that he will find his pleasure increase in proportion to the discussion of the subject. I have one other remark to place before him. ‘Philalethes’ writes: ‘In the year 1874, Sir H. Peek applied to the Bishop of London to issue a commission to inquire into the possible amalgamation of the parishes of St. Margaret, St. George, and St. Mary, the church of the latter, in his estimation, Wren’s *chef d’œuvre* in this locality, being made the church of Billingsgate.’ This scheme seemed to be in a fair way to success, when a misunderstanding arises between Sir Henry and his rector, a law-suit ensues, and the former, being defeated, refuses to have anything more to do with the scheme. Before the suit St. Mary’s was to be retained; after it that church is to be demolished also, and St. Dunstan’s substituted. Will Sir Henry kindly explain how it was that, after this defeat St. Mary’s ceased to be ‘in his estimation Sir C. Wren’s *chef d’œuvre*,’ and St. Dunstan’s succeeded to the honours of which St. Mary’s had been stripped! I will say no more on this subject until Sir Henry has commented on the letter of ‘Philalethes.’ Lastly, one more remark I must make on the letter of ‘H. H.’ He writes, ‘From its position, its architecture, and its present style of service, St. Dunstan’s is the church which ought to remain.’ Its position is in no way superior to that of St. Mary’s; two minutes’ extra walk will not greatly distress an earnest worshipper. Architecturally, it is not one of Sir C. Wren’s churches, whereas St. Mary’s is; and lastly, will ‘H. H.’ kindly explain how he reconciles the statement that it ought to remain on account of its ‘present style of services’ with the fact that with a population more than equal to St. Mary’s, it has only one-thirtieth part of the worshippers; that, while it has a population nearly thrice that of St. Margaret’s, it has

only one-fifteenth of the worshippers? Trusting to your sense of fairness to insert these remarks, and to the courtesy and pleasure of my opponents for a reply,

"I am, &c.,

"September 14th, 1878.

"VERITAS."

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE CITIZEN."

"Sir Henny Peek, Bart., M.P., and patron of the three livings of Cranleigh, Rousdon, and St. Andrew Hubbard, in the City of London, has just propounded a bold scheme for the union of the benefices of seven city parishes, the demolition of three churches, and the retention of St. Dunstan's-in-the-East as the only church for the proposed united parishes. The reason assigned for the selection of this church in preference to those of St. Mary-at-Hill, St. George, Botolph Lane, or St. Margaret Pattens, is, 'that it is one of Sir Christopher Wren's *chefs d'œuvre*,' and moreover equi-distant from All-Hallows, Barking, and St. Magnus, London Bridge. The two latter commodious churches, and the historical associations with which they are invested, speak loudly for their preservation, but the allegation that St. Dunstan's has superior claims in consequence of its tower being surmounted with a graceful spire, supported by flying buttresses, is a very impotent argument to adduce. The truth is that local and special reasons can be advanced in favour of the retention of every city church, and it is difficult indeed to adopt any other principle in their removal than that recognised in the fast decreasing resident population of the city, and the consequent limited congregations attending the city churches. I am aware that this suggestion is open to the objection that the city population is of a very migratory and fluctuating character, still it must be conceded that the number of inhabitants in any one parish should determine the propriety of removing or retaining any particular church. Prior to the great fire of 1666 there were no less than 97 churches within the city walls. The decimation of the population from the plague, which preceded the fire, necessitated the union of 69 parishes, and the restoration of only 34 churches for the same. The benefices of 15 churches were not united, and with the 13 churches beyond the boundary of the fire, the number of city churches was then reduced to 62. Since that period, mainly by the operation of the Union of Benefices (City of London) Act, 1860, 14 other churches have been pulled down, leaving no less than 48 now standing within an area of less than half a square mile, in the midst of a population which numbered only 28,093 in 1871, and supported by an annual income of nearly £40,000. In 1875 Sir Henry concocted a scheme for the retention of the church of St. Mary-at-Hill in union with five other parishes. The failure of this project is now attributed to the Rural Dean and Canon Gregory; but the fact is the concurrence of the

vestry of the parish and that of the patron is necessary before any benefice can be amalgamated. About this period of time Sir Henry was desirous of acquiring the reversion of the glebe land of St. Mary-at-Hill church upon which his warehouses are erected, but having failed to obtain the assent of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to the contract, the Master of the Rolls declined to decree for specific performance. Sir Henry now seeks the destruction of the very church which only two years since he sought so ardently to maintain, for, seeing the impracticability of the machinery provided under the Act for the union of the City benefices, now suggests a commission to take evidence 'all round,' and then apply for a special Act of Parliament. Upon the resumption of the sittings of the Common Council, Sir Henry threatens to send a copy of his proposal to each member, but what interest this body can have in the question (save that the Corporation have a moiety of the advowson of St. George's) I am at a loss to divine. The reduction of the City churches to a number proportioned to the population requires to be embodied in a 'well threshed' comprehensive scheme, and not to be dealt with piecemeal as now proposed. Nearly twenty years have elapsed since the Union of Benefices Act was passed, and only ten churches have at present been pulled down, as I believe the churches of St. Christopher, St. Bartholomew, St. Bene't-fink, and St. Michael, Crooked Lane, were removed prior to the Act coming into operation.

"J. B.

"Hop Exchange, Southwark,
"September 20th."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "THE CITIZEN."

"Sir,—In reply to 'Philaethes' in your last, to my knowledge two attempts for Union of City Churches in Billingsgate Ward have been made—one, about twenty years ago for St. Mary-at-Hill with St. Botolph; the other, four years since, to constitute St. Mary-at-Hill St. Botolph, and St. Gabriel one benefice, when, as he truly says, I advocated the retention of St. Mary-at-Hill as the church for the six parishes. Both schemes fell through, how I don't exactly know, but the proceedings in the Rolls Court had no more to do with the latter than Tenterden Steeple with the Goodwin Sands, respecting which I append an extract from one of old Bishop Latimer's sermons, which will interest your readers. During the past four years the population of the seven parishes has considerably declined, and the threatened demolition of many more houses will so far reduce the number of resident parishioners that St. Dunstan's-in-the-East will now be more than sufficient for the seven parishes. Delay such union a few years and no one will probably be surprised if the same church be not considered ample for All Hallow's, Barking, and St. Magnus as well, or eleven parishes instead of seven, as now proposed, with one

church. As 'Philalethes' is evidently very imperfectly acquainted with the facts as to the recent suits, I may say there were two. In the one, owing to the technical grounds taken by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, which appear to me very dangerous in a public point of view, the case was not gone into at all, and I was nonsuited, with heavy costs to pay, but which, as I have informed the Bishops of London and Rochester, will be fully recouped by the withdrawal of large subscriptions of many years' date from their diocesan societies; the second, the other side thought it prudent to withdraw with a result as to expenses reported to be not very satisfactory to the twice bankrupt legal stranger, who, for reasons which may be easily imagined, was ready enough to stir up strife. The offer made by me for the Glebe would not now be repeated; the freehold will probably never vest in me, but I quite expect before three years are over that it will be seen, by its being compulsorily taken, that the Church has lost many hundreds by the action of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, which, to my mind, has been so unbusinesslike and unjust, that on public grounds I shall promptly avail myself of any opportunity which may offer to bring it again under notice.

"Yours faithfully,

"HENRY W. PEEK,

"20, Eastcheap, E. C., 19th Sept., 1878.

"Bishop Latimer in one of his sermons preached before King Edward the Sixth, calls the following 'a merry toy.' Master More was once sent in commission into Kent to help to try out, if it might be, what was the cause of Goodwin Sands and the shelf that stopped up Sandwich Haven. A variety of witnesses were examined, among others a very aged man, who Sir Thomas called to him and said, 'Father,' said he, 'tell me, if ye can, what is the cause of this great rising of the sands and shelves here about this haven, the which stop it up that no ships can arrive here? Ye are the eldest man that I can espy in all this company, so that if any man can tell any cause of it ye of likelihood can say most in it; or, at leastwise, more than any other man here assembled.' 'Yea, forsooth, good master,' quoth this old man, 'for I am well nigh an hundred years old, and no man here in this company anything near unto mine age.' 'Well, then,' quoth Master More, 'how say ye in this matter? what think ye to be the cause of these shelves and flats that stop up Sandwich Haven?' 'Forsooth, sir,' quoth he, 'I am an old man; I think that Tenterton Steeple is the cause of Goodwin Sands. For I am an old man, sir,' quoth he, 'and I may remember the building of Tenterton Steeple; and I may remember when there was no steeple at all there. And before that Tenterton Steeple was in building there was no manner of speaking of any flats or sands that stopped the haven; and, therefore, I think that Tenterton Steeple is the cause of the destroying and decay of Sandwich Haven.'"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CITY PRESS."

"Sir,—In reply to "Veritas," in the *City Press* of Saturday, the 14th inst., I really do not understand to what (a) refers; I thought, and think still, that all previous salient points had been noticed by me, and have certainly not the slightest wish to shirk any. As regards (b), which relates to the average attendance at the four churches of St. George, St. Dunstan's, St. Gabriel's, and St. Mary-at-Hill, I stated, and still maintain, that on several successive Sundays this year the attendance (excluding officials and their families) has not nearly averaged one hundred; that the figures of "Veritas" have proved this, and so, too, now do the statistics given in yours of Wednesday, the 11th, signed "Arthur Trower, rector." (I can, in totalling the four churches, only give Sunday mornings, as in St. George's there is no second service, and St. Mary-at-Hill is in the evening, in charge of an independent lecturer, and so, I presume, is St. Dunstan's, as the Clergy List gives the name of a second reverend gentleman there also.) The 32 Sunday mornings Mr. Trower gives total 1,571 worshippers, or an average of 49. The rector, clerk, vergers, pew-opener, organist, blower, choir, and their families, do not average less than 30, leaving 19 for the congregation, to which add five each for St. George's and St. Dunstan's, or 29 for the three churches, leaving 70 for St. Gabriel's, or at least seven times the usual average at that church to make up my 100 for the four. The communicants at St. Mary-at-Hill on 32 Sundays with a weekly celebration, as given in a separate column, total 405, whereas, if the officials and their families all presented themselves, the numbers should be 960, or omitting the boys, 704; and this is no slight confirmation of my accuracy. (c) is in the main answered under (b), but Mr. Trower states the evening congregation at his large church averages 14 more than in the morning, to which "Veritas" is welcome if he think it an increase in attendance worth having. As regards (d), it appears to me that officials and their families exist for the parish, not the parish and an expensive organization for them. A pretty frequent attendant at St. Mary-at-Hill tells me the choir consists of seven men and eight boys, one of whom, to his knowledge, comes from Rotherhithe, and another from Stratford, and that one was not long since fined 1s for non-attendance, which I presume implies that they are all paid for coming to draw the congregation, such as it is, instead of giving their services in their own parishes miles off. Not being a parish estates trustee I am unable to speak confidently from my own knowledge as to payments. As regards (e), Englishmen are fortunately not compelled to attend any particular church. Were St. Dunstan's half the size it is it would conveniently hold double the average congregations (not to say parishioners) for whom four churches have for so long been wastefully provided. (f). To my mind twenty-eight members of the Corporation would fairly represent the resident opinion, and so get rid of the question of patronage, which has hitherto had a good deal to

do with keeping the abuses under consideration in full bloom. From the above, "Veritas" will gather that I fully agree with his concluding remarks under the letter (*g*). Mr. Trower's figures further give the average week-day attendance at 16 ; in other words, half the officials and their families stay away, although probably occasional choir attendance is compulsory. Whether the Royal Commissioners—the Duke of Northumberland, Canon Gregory, Prebendary Rogers, Mr. Herschell, M.P., Mr. Cubitt, M.P., Mr. Pell, M.P., and Mr. H. H. Gibbs—will allow that long-suffering milch cow, the parish estate, much longer to find the funds for heavy expenses, with such results, remains to be seen. Were the private pockets of the inhabitants of the ward applied to, I know very well what the result would be. I have already applied to be examined before the Royal Commissioners, as I was before the gentlemen appointed by the late Bishop of London many years ago, and hope other citizens who in the main agree with me will be willing to do the same.

"I am, &c., HENRY W. PEEK."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CITY PRESS."

"Sir,—I trespass on your courtesy for the last time and beg that you will insert the 'last words' of 'Veritas': not that I feel conscious of approaching dissolution in consequence of Sir H. Peek's letter of Saturday, but because I am certain that, whatever scheme may ultimately be adopted in regard to the demolition of city churches, this particular one which Sir Henry has gathered, has been so well 'threshed out,' that it has not sufficient vitality left to raise its head again. Sir Henry again asserts that my figures prove his assertion. I really cannot spend my time in lavishing mathematical demonstrations upon Sir Henry if he will persist in saying that $110 + 80 + 10 =$ not nearly one hundred. Life is far too short for such profitless exercises. To my question (*c*) Sir Henry virtually returns no answer at all. Why are evening worshippers to be excluded from the calculation? He simply replies that he cannot do so because there is a lecturer at St. Mary's, and possibly one at St. Dunstan's. This is no answer at all. The people would be worshippers, and therefore would have to be reckoned up even if Cardinal Manning preached, or if Sir Henry held forth on the 'wicked waste of means for good' involved in the retention of so many churches, provided that such addresses were preceded by Evensong, or worship paid to Almighty God. The people are worshippers, and the fact that independent lecturers preach, does not affect the question at all. As Sir Henry has not answered my question, each person will doubtless answer it for himself. (*d*) Sir Henry has again avoided my inquiry as to the cause of his deep-rooted objection (not yet overcome) to the families of officials, and as to the fact of their being, or not being, parishioners. He simply replies that officials and their families exist

for the parish, not the parish and an expensive organization for them. This, again, is no answer at all. For excluding the officials of a church I can see reason for excluding their families none. It is perfectly open to them to attend the cathedral, or any other church, and if they keep to their own church, they must certainly be reckoned in the numbers. It might be better for many city parishes if they saw more of the 'officials' and 'their families.' There is more to come out here when Sir Henry is willing to let us have it—till then I am silent. At the same time I cannot see in what way the families of rectors exist for the parish. Have the parishioners, as a body, vested rights in these families? Perhaps Sir Henry would place these also under the fostering care of the 28 councilmen. Rectors, beware! (e) Sir Henry has entirely missed my meaning. I did not refer to the capability of St. Dunstan's for holding the bodies, but the feelings and interest of the worshippers. With 669 inhabitants it has a congregation of five, minus 'the families of officials.' If this be so, and if it cannot attract its own parishioners to service, it certainly will not attract those of neighbouring parishes. I suppose that as Englishmen are fortunately not compelled to attend any particular church, they are at perfect liberty to give their services where they please, without being sneered at. (f) Sir Henry states that he proposed 28 councilmen, because they would fairly represent the resident opinion. This I cannot at all understand, unless these 28 are all resident; and, if they are, then it is a great pity that they do not frequent the parish church. In conclusion, I have from the first quite agreed with Sir Henry that two or three of the churches might be spared, for they are not required. But I cannot see why, unless there be further reasons not yet made public, he should wish to demolish St. Mary's the most energetic, and retain St. Dunstan's the most unsatisfactory church. If, as he asserts, St. Dunstan's would more than four times accommodate the united congregations, surely St. Mary's must be equal to one-fourth of St. Dunstan's, and therefore will, equally well, and on other grounds, better do so. That has been, and still is, my difficulty. I am quite prepared to support any well-considered scheme which would effect this desirable object; but, such schemes as the present, put forth without any author being named, and then turning out to be that of a patron, do more harm than good; for human nature is so suspicious that it will always impute interested motives to their authors. I sincerely trust that the Royal Commissioners will remedy this very soon, but I am also confident that, if the 'long-suffering milch cow' be no longer made to find the funds for heavy expenses for parish services, neither will it be suffered to provide milk for parishes which private patrons may wish to augment in value. Thanking you, sir, for your courtesy in inserting these letters, and again assuring Sir Henry that I have taken up the matter, and 'well-threshed out' his scheme on purely public grounds, and without any desire or wish to hurt his feelings, I ask you to insert these, the last words of

"September 25th.

"VERITAS."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CITY PRESS."

"Sir,—In your last Sir H. Peek puts the congregation of St. Gabriel's at 10. It is doubtless very considerably more, consisting, as it must, of generations from the original foundation of that church to its final destruction by the Great Fire in 1666. But inasmuch as it worships (it is to be hoped) in the realms of disembodied spirits, it would be presumptuous to attempt to gauge its limits so as to satisfy the accurate mind of Sir H. Peek. There is, however, a church called St. Margaret Pattens, within a stone's throw of the spot on which Sir H. Peek has doubtless spent most of his life. With less presumption I can give him the numbers present at service in that church yesterday, when the attendance was much below the average. I exclude all soulless "officials," from the rector down to the organ-blower and their families, and take in only those who are not paid in respect of their attendance. There were present at a quarter-past eight, 12; at a quarter to eleven, 35; and at seven, 43. If I add the soulless ones, about 15 more must be included. Yesterday, as I have said, the congregations were smaller than usual. If on Sunday next, when the harvest festival will be continued, Sir H. Peek puts in an appearance, with or without a peace-offering from his conservatories at Wimbledon, he will doubtless find them far larger.

"I am, &c.,

"September 23rd."

"SUB CRUCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CITY PRESS."

"Sir,—Were Sir Henry Peek's statements placed by the side of facts, how would they look? I venture to say that before a jury of honourable men he would shrink from advancing them. The time may come when a string of them set before himself may even startle him. Looking at his letter, one is amazed at his clumsy endeavours to dispose, or rather, I may say, 'shirk' the searching questions of 'Veritas.' Let us look at one or two of his remarks, and take first the reason he assigns for stating that 'attendance' can apply only to 'the morning services.' He says, 'I can, in totalling the four churches, only give Sunday mornings, as in St. George's there is no second service, and St. Mary-at-Hill is in the evening in charge of an independent lecturer, and so, I presume, is St. Dunstan's, as the 'Clergy List' gives the name of a second gentleman there also." Now, what is the conclusion most persons, ignorant of the facts, would draw from this as regards St. Mary-at-Hill? Why surely that the evening service was entirely under the superintendence of the lecturer, and that the rector had nothing whatever to do with it. But is this the case? No one knows better than Sir H. Peek that it is not so. Again, he says, 'The communicants at St. Mary-at-Hill on 32 Sundays, with a weekly celebration, as given in a separate column, total 405; whereas if the officials and their families all presented themselves, the

numbers should be 960, or, omitting the boys, 704, and this is no slight confirmation of my accuracy.' What does he mean? How does this confirm his accuracy? Why should there be 960, or even 704? Does he mean that every one who attends church should attend the Holy Communion, and that their not doing so is proof that the church should be pulled down? That there should be a larger attendance I willingly grant; but perhaps as the world is, it is hardly to be expected. However, the attendance at St. Mary-at-Hill will not contrast unfavourably with some other churches, and if Sir H. Peek's clerks would come to church not only to spy out and number the people, but to worship as they ought and partake of the Holy Communion, it would be more creditable to them and himself too. It would take up too much of your space were I to go through the letter as I could wish, but I am unwilling to pass by his remarks touching the fine of 1s. imposed upon a choir-boy for non-attendance which, he says, 'I presume implies that they are all paid for coming to draw the congregation, such as it is, instead of giving their services in their own parishes miles off.' Sir H. Peek, good churchman as he is supposed to be, evidently knows very little, if anything, about choirs—which is not to be wondered at when his early training is taken into consideration—but he might suppose that there must be rules for choirs, and fines, too, just as he finds it necessary to have rules and fines too for his clerks when their attendance is not punctual. I quite agree with him that it would be better that these boys who, he says, come from a distance, should attend their own parish church, and, if needs be, give their services as singers there; but in these days, when the parochial system is broken up, who is to compel them to do so? Let me ask Sir H. Peek, who thinks these boys ought to go to their parish church, why he walks 'three miles across the common to a church' instead of attending his parish church at Wimbledon? It may be the excuses these boys have to give would be found to be less blameworthy than the one he has to give. Lastly, sir, we are warned that Sir H. Peek 'has applied to be examined before the Royal Commissioners' at the approaching investigation into the parochial charities, when he intends to ask 'whether they will allow that long-suffering *milk cow*, the parish estate, much longer to find the funds for heavy expenses with such results.' And, as if further to strike dismay into the minds of those who will not see as he sees, nor do as he bids, he gives the names of the Commissioners, who doubtless he thinks will be as pliable in his hands as he has found some other Commissioners, but who, though he may have a patron and friends among them, will probably let him know that the duty imposed upon them will be performed with that honour, integrity, and independence which we may reasonably expect will be the case from such men placed in such a position.

I am, &c.,

"ARTHUR TROWER.

"The Rectory, St. Mary-at-Hill, Sept. 23rd."

[The correspondence on this subject must, so far as we are concerned, now cease.—ED. C.P.]

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE CITIZEN."

"Sir,—My interest in the scheme for removal of three of the churches in the above-named wards (in which I was formerly a resident) is, I think, identical with that of many thousands who are daily occupied in the City, but whose residences, are of necessity in the suburbs, where church accommodation is wholly inadequate, many of the newly-erected edifices being of the meanest description, heavily laden with debt, and the incumbent's income barely that of a junior mercantile clerk. It is with a view to remedy this state of things that I advocate transference of City endowments. Regardless of the opinion of your correspondent 'J.B.,' to my mind the members of the Common Council are the very men whose special attention ought to be drawn to the subject; in fact, 'J. B.' himself suggests that the scheme should be embodied in a comprehensive manner. Replying to your correspondent 'Veritas,' the conspicuous position, the open space around it, the beautiful modern architecture of its nave, and its cheerful aspect, are sufficient reasons for the retention of St. Dunstan's in preference to the others. Moreover, it is no obstruction as regards street improvements. On the other hand, St. Mary's exterior is extremely ugly, its towers ungraceful, the approaches miserable, and the light partially excluded from the interior by huge warehouses—an exclusion possibly in which some rectors, whose tuition has been gained at Hatcham, may rejoice. St. Margaret's appears to be in a state of decay. I was induced, by the remarks of 'Veritas,' to attend service at St. Dunstan's on Sunday morning last, and counted 21 in the congregation, exclusive of officials, and 8 boys sitting in the centre aisle. I ask, therefore, in all sincerity, that 'Veritas' may be allowed to correct his statement in your next issue. Taking the average Sunday morning attendance at St. Mary's at 49, deducting 30 for officials, leave an actual congregation of 19, or 2 less than that of St. Dunstan's. My remark as to 'present style of service' may perhaps be from my own point of view. A happy medium will probably suit the majority—*medio tutissimū ibis*—and would, no doubt, be obtained under the proposed amalgamation.

"September 24th, 1878.

Yours truly, "H. H."

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE CITIZEN."

"Sir,—In Sir Henry Peek's scheme for the demolition of three City churches he speaks of 'the wicked waste of means,' and in a letter published in a weekly newspaper he says: 'Whether the Royal Commissioners will allow that long-suffering *milch cow*, the parish estate, to find funds for heavy expenses with such results remains to be seen.' Now, it is a noteworthy fact that when Mr. now Sir H. Peek, was churchwarden, he was so careful to avoid 'a wicked waste of means' that he acted very differently from his predecessors in office. He was not contented to have *one* parish dinner in the year, but he must have *two*. Here is the account as it stands in the churchwarden's account

Since this appeared in *The Citizen* a letter signed "Late Churchwarden" has been sent to me, in which it is stated that the last dinner was not given at the suggestion of Sir H. Peek.

A. T.



book : 'The parish of St. Mary-at-Hill church account in account with Henry William Peek, churchwarden, 1855 to 1856.—Miscellaneous : To Albion Tavern, bill of dinner, £26 5s ; do. Chipp, music, £3 3s. —£29 8s. To Blackwall dinner, £40 11s. ; do. Chipp, music, £9 9s. —£50. And it is also to be observed that the only dinner which has been given since I have been rector of St. Mary-at-Hill was given, if I have not been misinformed, at the suggestion of Sir H. Peek ; but then we must bear in mind the scheme for making St. Mary-at-Hill the church of Billingsgate had to be introduced, and the difficulty of getting over the patronage question to be touched upon, the sale of the glebe and of the moiety of the patronage in Sir H. Peek's possession, the £1,500 (the valuation of Mr. Joseph Aston, of the Bounty Office) not to go into pocket, but to be laid out in building a parsonage house on the property in Devonshire. All these things were to be looked at, and those gentlemen who attended that dinner may recollect how clearly Sir H. Peek, in his speech, set the case before us, and how advantageous to all concerned it appeared ; but, alas ! sir, the attempt to buy the glebe failed, and thus, of course, upset all these pleasant plans, and now make it desirable that the church of St. Mary-at-Hill should be got rid of altogether.

"I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

"The Rectory, St. Mary-at-Hill.

"ARTHUR TROWER."

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE CITIZEN."

"Sir,—This subject is of far too great importance to go off either on puerilities or personalities. I am having the whole correspondence reprinted for local circulation, and will take such opportunity of in a few sentences settling the childish charges in the letter which appears in your number of 27th Sept., signed 'Arthur Trower.' Our neighbours will by such means also judge for themselves as to the appropriateness of the *nom de plume* 'Veritas' and 'Philaethes,' while the Ordnance map of this part of the city (reduced by photography) will help to make the matter clear to all who care to go into the local questions. In 1517 Luther posted up at the church door of Wittenberg those ninety-five theses which soon made themselves very widely heard ; and, no doubt, with much the same object in view. Mr. Gladstone, in a late number of the 'Nineteenth Century,' gives under twenty-two heads a 'slight sketch of some unredeemed engagements'—in not a few of these cases the mischief amounts to positive scandal. No. 1 stands as London Municipal Reform ; No. 14 City Companies. Mr. Gladstone with many still carries great weight, and these twenty-two texts are sure to be enlarged upon when convenient opportunities offer. How important then that such a scandal as the present position of the city churches should be taken up and dealt with before an overwhelming and perhaps a very undesirable form of pressure is brought to bear upon it. The Common Council of London has rightly

earned the gratitude of millions by its course of action as regards Epping Forest. The city's material interests there were but slight; much less, indeed, than in this matter of the churches of Billingsgate and Tower Wards, as the next presentation to the rectory of St. Gabriel with St. Margaret Pattens, the most valuable of the four—£811 per annum, population under 200—is in the gift of the Corporation. The forest was well fought through every stage in both Houses, and I believe, certainly in one sense, even more good would be done by earnestly taking up this question of the superabundant city churches. If there were the slightest chance of their ever again being useful the case would be different, but it is the common talk that at least two dozen might be removed with great advantage, and still a more than sufficient supply be left. Not to press the old lines that 'Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do,' clergymen, like other people, where work is next to *nil* and pay secured, are apt to become drones, and with daily appeals from suburbs increasing in all directions it is certainly not too much to say that present arrangements, both as to men and means, are wasteful in the extreme. If to deal with the superfluous city churches by one comprehensive measure be too much even for the Corporation of London, then, rather than allow the evil to remain wholly unremedied, let St. Botolph, Billingsgate, with St. George, Botolph Lane, St. Dunstan's-in-the-East, St. Gabriel Fenchurch, with St. Margaret Pattens, and St. Mary-at-Hill with St. Andrew Hubbard—seven parishes with four churches—be taken in hand. It will be found that the residents do not now number more than 1,300 (probably 1,000 would be nearer the mark, with many houses threatened with immediate demolition) for whom there are 1,750 seats, and including the value of three rectory houses and two lectureships, not much less than £3,000 per annum for the duty to be performed, while, excluding officials and their families, the Sunday morning attendance for months running (this year) at all four churches put together has not nearly averaged one hundred, and probably not half of those present were parishioners. The Markets Committee and the Common Council appear to have had their attention drawn to the district; the former having granted leave to the missionary to preach on Sunday mornings at Billingsgate Market, which is not 200 yards from any one of the four churches named; and a few months later, in May last, the Common Council no doubt for sufficient reasons, which should be made generally known, granted to his employers, the London City Mission, founded and still supported by Churchmen and Dissenters in equal number, to promote the spiritual welfare of neighbourhoods suffering from over population or insufficient endowments or neglect, the handsome donation of £210. Royal Commissioners will soon commence inquiries into the £7,000 per annum gross charitable income of the seven parishes named. Let the city not be behindhand in the plain duty I have endeavoured to sketch out.

"Yours faithfully,

"20, Eastcheap, E.C., Oct. 3, 1878.

"HENRY W. PEEK."

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE CHURCH REVIEW."

This subject is, in our opinion, so important that we have in spite of the great pressure upon our columns, determined to print some further correspondence on the matter, especially as the city papers have now closed their columns against Mr. Trower, whose letter, part of which only has been permitted to appear, is printed below :—

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE CITIZEN."

Sir,—Two letters have appeared in your paper, bearing the initials "H.H.," neither of which would have called for any comment from me had the writer confined his remarks to simply advocating the retention of the church of St. Dunstan-in-the-East. He has, however, gone out of his way to try and excite the prejudices of persons ignorant of facts against a rector "whose tuition had been gained at Hatcham" by stating a *half truth*. It is quite true that the rector of St. Mary-at-Hill was at Hatcham, but it is not true that he has been there since 1868, at which time a very different state of things prevailed from that which has been in vogue of late years. Now, sir, "*to my mind*" (Oh! that well-known expression) it was pretty clear, on the appearance of these letters, that 'H. H.' of Putney (not probably unknown also at Messrs. Peek Bros.) had been borrowing the pen of another, and had, unwittingly of course, allowed it to run on in the same strain, and impress upon the paper the same phrases and the same ideas. One cannot but feel pity for a man if, through weakness, or for some other cause, he allow himself to do that which, in his better moments, he would shrink from doing; and, therefore, I will merely say to 'H. H.' that, had he questioned his pen before it copied that half truth, he might have felt some scruple on the score of honesty in writing it.

"But to pass to another matter. On Sir H. Peek putting forth his scheme I ventured to express a hope, through your paper, that the real reason for the demolition of the church of St. Mary-at-Hill might be taken into consideration. 'Philalethes' hinted at the result of a certain action in the Rolls Court being *that reason*. Sir. H. Peek, in reply, with a view to 'amuse your readers,' quoted an old tale, and says that the action 'had no more to do with the scheme than had Tenterton steeple with the Goodwin sands.' Would Sir H. Peek like me to bring proof—such proof as would carry conviction to the mind of every honest man—that it had everything to do with it? Let me ask him whether the whole of his actions from the 17th of August, 1876, to the present time—*e.g.*, his dismissal of my son from his establishment at a moment's notice on the day after I refused to return the deed of conveyance which had been sent back to me by order of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and to put my name to what was false; the stoppage, at his instigation, by the Charity Commissioners of 200*l.* voted to me by the vestry; the attack made upon me because I was a member of the English Church Union; the book

entitled 'Peek v. Trower,' sent to every member of the Court of the Drapers' Company; and many other pleasantries of a similar character—do not satisfactorily prove that the action at the Rolls Court had to do with the scheme? What will the public now think of his Tenterden steeple and his Goodwin sands?

"Sir, I have much more to say; at present, however, I forbear. But if Sir H. Peek, who is very fond of the printing press, will undertake to pay the expenses, I will have printed (it is all prepared) the whole of the case touching the sale of the glebe, the Charity Commissioners case, the E. C. U. case, in fact, every paper connected with the above, including the very edifying and remarkable correspondence of the Brothers Aston, and let the public fairly judge between us.

"I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

"ARTHUR TROWER."

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE CHURCH REVIEW."

"Sir,—Having taken a rather prominent part in the above correspondence, I beg that you will insert these few remarks, which I made in the main in a letter sent to the editor of the *Citizen*, but which was for some reason or another suppressed. In the *Citizen* of Sept. 20th, I made a series of comments upon the scheme in question, and also put a series of questions to Sir Henry Peek. In the *City Press* of the 22nd ult., he wrote as follows: 'I have certainly not the slightest wish to shirk any of the salient points.' After such a declaration as this I naturally expected that some attempt would have been made to satisfy my inquiring spirit. However, he kept silence, and I was doomed to disappointment. I could only account for Sir Henry's silence by supposing that he had deemed discretion the better part of valour. If this be so, no one rejoices more in the fact than I do, but I wish to point out the fact that these queries were put, and that Sir Henry, while professing great anxiety to satisfy all inquiries, made no attempt to answer mine.

"I then commented on the letter of 'H. H.,' which appeared in the *Citizen* of Sept. 27, and on which the Rev. A. Trower has already remarked. My comments were in the main as follows: While dealing thus with Sir H. Peek, far otherwise must be my treatment of 'H. H.,' whose letter calls for a sharp castigation couched in no uncertain tones. I exceedingly regret the sad state of the suburban churches (which he had depicted in heartrending terms), but the fault must lie either in the clergy, who do not win the sympathy of their parishioners, or in the lamentable poverty which afflicts all classes of the laity when asked for an offertory at church. As 'H. H.' is a classical scholar he is doubtless aware of the following fact:—Cicero tells us that the Pythagoreans when asked for the authority on which they made a statement used simply to reply "*Ipse dixit*"—i.e., Pythagoras. Here was modesty, for they deferred to the authority of one who was

greater than themselves. But no such charming modesty finds a lodging within the heart of 'H. H.,' for he simply meets the objection of 'J. B.' to the twenty-four common-council men with the remark, 'To my mind the members of the common-council are the very men whose special attention ought to be drawn to the subject.' Therefore, let all readers of the *Citizen* know in future that when once 'H. H.,' of Putney, has said 'to my mind it appears,' all further argument is at an end. The remarks of 'H. H.' on the relative positions of St. Mary-at-Hill and St. Dunstan's are puerile in the extreme. I would simply ask 'H. H.' whether any devout Christian selects his church because of 'its conspicuous position, the open space around it, the beautiful modern architecture of its nave, and its cheerful aspect'? This is simply an ill-concealed attempt to shirk the question at issue by diverting attention to a minor point. St. Mary's towers may be 'ungraceful, its exterior extremely ugly, its approaches miserable, its light partially excluded by huge warehouses.' These are questions of taste which 'H. H.' may decide for himself. To 'H. H.' St. Margaret's appears to be in a state of decay. It seems very strange that the remarks of 'H. H.' should be almost entirely restricted to the exterior of the churches; and even here it is a matter of the most supreme indifference to him whether St. Mary's has a tower or 'towers.' It used to have but one, unless another was added when the clock was recently repaired! 'H. H.' again brings forward an arithmetical calculation. He states that the number attending St. Dunstan's was twenty-one on the Sunday morning on which he went. I had stated the average at five. He then asks that I may in all sincerity correct my statement. But, sir, I have nothing to correct, for he will not venture to assert that twenty-one is an average congregation, and, even if it were, it would not materially affect my argument. I really cannot spend time in disproving arithmetical calculations which are an exact reproduction of Sir H. Peek.

"But surely, sir, such a discussion as this ought to be carried on without the mingling with it of religious party spirit. In the name of all that is fair what does 'H. H.' mean by the following remark, 'An exclusion, possibly, in which some rectors whose tuition has been gained at Hatcham may rejoice'? Such a remark made anonymously is simply throwing mud from behind a wall in the hope that the thrower will escape while some is sure to stick; and such an act is cowardly and mean in the extreme. 'H. H.' must have known that the curacy of the Rev. A. Trower at Hatcham terminated before what he is pleased to term 'darkness' brooded there. If he did not know it his conduct is equally inexcusable for not having ascertained his facts before stating them in a paper. If this conduct be the outcome of that light in which 'H. H.' revels, I earnestly pray for the sake of the fair fame of Englishmen that this light may quickly be extinguished, and that the pure light of honesty and manly dealing may soon rise on those who like 'H. H.' have been led away by this will-o'-the-wisp,

that light which says, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also to them likewise.' Before 'H. H.' thus again rushes into print I sincerely hope that he will have learnt this lesson.

"In conclusion I would add a few remarks :

- "(a) Sir Henry Peek has not explained how in the year 1874 he proposed to retain St. Mary-at-Hill as the church of the united parishes, while after the lawsuit in which he was worsted he wishes to demolish St. Mary-at-Hill as well. It is useless to urge that the population fell off in these three years so as to render advisable the demolition of St. Mary's Church.
- "(b) He has not explained how before the lawsuit St. Mary's was Sir. C. Wren's *chef d'œuvre* in the locality, while after the lawsuit he suddenly discovered that St. Dunstan's occupied that position, even though St. Dunstan's was not Wren's church at all.
- "(c) He has not explained at all his deep-rooted objection to the reckoning of the families of officials, a remark obviously aimed at the rector of St. Mary-at-Hill, whose family is the only one which is likely to draw attention.
- "(d) How can Sir Henry reconcile the two following statements in his letter of Oct. 4?—"This subject is of far too great importance to go off either on puerilities or personalities.' 'Our neighbours will also judge as to the appropriateness of the *noms de plume* 'Veritas' and 'Philaethes.' " Sir Henry first of all deprecates 'going off into personalities,' and straight-way 'goes off' into an innuendo against 'Veritas' and 'Philaethes.' Perhaps as Sir Henry is speaking of another he does not deem the impugning of their veracity a 'personality.' If Sir Henry thinks that he has made a shrewd guess in supposing that 'Veritas' and 'Philaethes' are identical he has been guilty of a 'puerility,' to use his own word. If Sir Henry have no argument to bring forward save abuse, then indeed silence would be golden.
- "(e) Sir Henry seems to think that, having had the worst of the argument, he can pursue no better plan than that of making once more the identical assertions which he made at the beginning of this discussion, and which have already been 'threshed' to pieces. Having done this, and having branded, by means of an innuendo, his opponents as opponents of "truth," he thinks that the battle is over and the victory won. Time will prove this.
- "(f) Sir Henry threatens us with the printing press. He will print all and show us up. That is the very thing which we want. Only let the correspondence be made public property, and the whole scheme will collapse like an air-balloon with a hole in it.

“Lastly, these remarks are all made in the hope of bringing out the *whole* truth of the matter. I am in no way officially connected with the parishes. I am not an opponent of all reform in this matter; but I am an opponent of all that savours of personal feeling and party spirit. I trust that Sir Henry and ‘H. H.’ will receive these remarks in a kindly spirit, and that they may experience the truth of the words of the wise man, ‘Faithful are the wounds of a friend.’ I hope for a reply from Sir Henry and ‘H. H.’

“VERITAS.”

TO THE EDITOR OF THE “CHURCH REVIEW.”

“Sir,—As Sir Henry Peek and his able coadjutor of Putney have not condescended to answer my letter of the 12th inst., I beg that you will insert this letter in order that the correspondence may be closed. There is no good whatever in wasting powder and shot upon antagonists who will not, or cannot, reply, and I am very unwilling to add in any way to the dismay which must strike at the heart of the author of the scheme in question as he sits down calmly and thinks of his scheme, which on August 30th was full of vitality, now doubled up like a house of cards, now thoroughly ‘threshed out,’ with but a poor result in the way of good grain. Hitherto my attention has been directed in the main to Sir Henry and our friend of Putney. In this last letter I propose to give your readers a selection from Sir Henry’s writings, in order that they may judge for themselves of the motives which have urged him to this course of action. All the quotations shall be made in Sir Henry’s own words, so that I may not in any way misrepresent him :—

“1. ‘I have no private interests whatever to serve’ (Sir H. Peek, Sep 10th). If Sir Henry be actuated by none but the highest motives for the good of the church, I think that it is, to say the least, a very great pity that he has allowed a feeling, which appears to ordinary mortals, like myself, very like personal feeling, to enter into the question, such as—

“(a) ‘Excluding officials and their families’—aimed obviously at his rector (Aug. 30th).

“(b) ‘Excluding officials and their families’ (Sept. 11th).

“(c) ‘Exclusive of officials and their families’ (Sept. 13th).

“(d) ‘Statistics signed “Arthur Trower,” rector’ (Sept. 21st).

“(e) ‘It appears to me that officials and their families exist for the parish, not the parish and an expensive organization for them’ (Sept. 21st). I say that in the face of Sir Henry’s assertion that he had no private interests to serve, it is a great pity that he should have displayed such hostility towards his rector, as would not suffer him to speak of him in any more respectful manner than ‘Arthur Trower, rector.’

- “(f) ‘In 1874, St. Mary-at-Hill was in Sir Henry’s estimation the *chef d’œuvre* of Sir Christopher Wren in the locality. In 1878, immediately after a lawsuit, in which he was worsted, St. Dunstan’s occupied in his estimation this position, in the face of the fact that the latter was not Wren’s church at all. This sudden change of opinion as to the relative architectural claims of the two churches, occurring at such a time, is, to say the least, unfortunate, and will, I fear, add to the strength of the feeling in the minds of many that there are other motives than merely public interests.
- “(g) ‘Patrons, of course, must be properly compensated. No one would wish a public advantage gained at the expense of private wrong’ (Aug. 30th). Patrons, says Sir Henry, must be compensated. No private wrong must be done to them. He says nothing about compensating the three rectors in question. As they are not “patrons,” but “rectors,” the withdrawal of their incomes is, apparently, in his estimation, no “private wrong.”
- “(h) ‘He is unwilling to admit the fact that he would be a direct gainer by the carrying out of the scheme, inasmuch as he would increase the value of a private living just six times, and so increase its marketable value to the same extent
- “2. Sir Henry writes :—‘I have no private interests to serve ; for upwards of thirty years I have worked in the same direction, believing that if the Church of England is to hold her own it must be by making the most of all her means for good’ (Sept. 10th). Against that I place the following quotation from a letter dated Sept. 19th :—‘In the one suit, owing to the technical grounds taken by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the case was not gone into at all, and I was nonsuited with heavy costs to pay, but which, as I have informed the Bishops of London and Rochester, will be fully recouped by the withdrawal of large subscriptions of many years’ date from their diocesan societies.’ Is this the crowning act of one towards the church which, for thirty years, he has been endeavouring to maintain and strengthen? I think it a great pity that the diocesan funds of London and Rochester should suffer by the withdrawal of subscriptions, which Sir Henry informs us were large, simply because he goes to law and is worsted.
- “3. ‘I have certainly not the slightest wish to shirk any of the salient points’ (Sept. 21). As a fact, I have put to Sir Henry a series of questions on what appear to be the most salient points, and he has simply passed them over in silence, as in the *Church Review* of Oct. 12th and the *Citizen* of Sept. 14th.
- “4. Sir Henry is particularly anxious to extinguish the church of St. Mary. That is quite evident ; and when the indisputable claims of that church over St. George’s, St. Margaret’s, and St.

Dunstan's are urged from an architectural and, above all, from a spiritual point of view, he simply reiterates, in a slightly altered form, the well-known cry, 'Delenda est Carthago.'

- "5. My opponents have endeavoured to use those last weapons of a defeated cause, abuse and inuendo. Our friend of Putney has thrown mud '*in re*' Hatcham; Sir Henry has abused me as an opponent of truth, and as having no right to the title 'Veritas.' This, in the eyes of all competent and unbiassed judges, will, I feel sure, strengthen my cause immeasurably.

"In conclusion, I would assure Sir Henry that I have taken the matter up on purely public grounds. Of him personally and of 'H. H.,' of Putney, his valuable coadjutor, I know absolutely nothing. I saw the scheme when it was first put forth, and as it struck me as manifestly inequitable to the clergy concerned and as in all respects unworthy of support, I have simply complied with his desire that the matter may be 'well threshed out.' From henceforth I am silent. The publication and circulation beyond the limits of the parish, and of the City of the entire correspondence, from the letter or scheme of Sir Henry Peek in the *City Press* of August 28 down to this letter in the *Church Review* of Oct. 26, will be the best possible means of having the matter well ventilated, well threshed out, and thoroughly well demolished. This course will be at once adopted; and I sincerely trust that when Sir Henry has printed the entire correspondence and circulated it among the Common Councilmen, &c., his success may repay him for the outlay in printing.

"VERITAS.

"Oct. 19, 1878."





